

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

-----X  
MOISES HERNANDEZ, *individually and on  
behalf of others similarly situated,*

*Plaintiff,*

**COMPLAINT**

*-against-*

FOOD & BEYOND LLC (D/B/A BREAD  
AND BUTTER), BARNABAS Y. WOO ,  
JIMMY KIM , KEVIN CHOI , and HYUN  
PARK ,

**COLLECTIVE ACTION UNDER  
29 U.S.C. § 216(b)**

**ECF Case**

*Defendants.*

-----X

Plaintiff Moises Hernandez (“Plaintiff Hernandez” or “Mr. Hernandez”), individually and on behalf of others similarly situated, by and through his attorneys, Michael Faillace & Associates, P.C., upon his knowledge and belief, and as against Food & Beyond LLC (d/b/a Bread and Butter), (“Defendant Corporation”), Barnabas Y. Woo, Jimmy Kim, Kevin Choi, and Hyun Park, (“Individual Defendants”), (collectively, “Defendants”), alleges as follows:

**NATURE OF ACTION**

1. Plaintiff Hernandez is a former employee of Defendants Food & Beyond LLC (d/b/a Bread and Butter), Barnabas Y. Woo, Jimmy Kim, Kevin Choi, and Hyun Park.
2. Defendants own, operate, or control a deli, located at 419 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10016 under the name “Bread and Butter”.
3. Upon information and belief, individual Defendants Barnabas Y. Woo, Jimmy Kim, Kevin Choi, and Hyun Park, serve or served as owners, managers, principals, or agents of Defendant Corporation and, through this corporate entity, operate or operated the deli as a joint or unified enterprise.

Park Avenue, New York, NY 10016.

5. Plaintiff Hernandez was ostensibly employed as a delivery worker. However, he was required to spend a considerable part of his work day performing non-tipped duties, including but not limited to cooking, mopping, cleaning the business, and stocking inventory (hereafter the “non-tipped duties”).

6. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Plaintiff Hernandez worked for Defendants in excess of 40 hours per week, without appropriate overtime and spread of hours compensation for the hours that he worked.

7. Rather, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff Hernandez appropriately for any overtime hours worked, either at the straight rate of pay or for any additional overtime premium.

8. Further, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff Hernandez the required “spread of hours” pay for any day in which he had to work over 10 hours a day.

9. Defendants employed and accounted for Plaintiff Hernandez as a delivery worker in their payroll, but in actuality his duties required a significant amount of time spent performing the non-tipped duties alleged above.

10. In addition, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of unlawfully appropriating Plaintiff Hernandez’s and other tipped employees’ tips and made unlawful deductions from Plaintiff Rivera’s and other tipped employees’ wages.

11. Defendants’ conduct extended beyond Plaintiff Hernandez to all other similarly situated employees.

12. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff Hernandez and other employees to work in excess of forty (40) hours per week without providing the overtime compensation required by federal and state law and regulations.

13. Plaintiff Hernandez now brings this action on behalf of himself, and other similarly situated individuals, for unpaid overtime wages pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938,

29 U.S.C. § 201 *et seq.* (“FLSA”), and for violations of the N.Y. Labor Law §§ 190 *et seq.* and 650 *et seq.* (the “NYLL”), and the “spread of hours” and overtime wage orders of the New York Commissioner of Labor codified at N.Y. COMP. CODES R. & REGS. tit. 12, § 146-1.6 (herein the “Spread of Hours Wage Order”), including applicable liquidated damages, interest, attorneys’ fees and costs.

14. Plaintiff Hernandez seeks certification of this action as a collective action on behalf of himself, individually, and all other similarly situated employees and former employees of Defendants pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

15. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question) and the FLSA, and supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff Hernandez’s state law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).

16. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) because all, or a substantial portion of, the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in this district, Defendants maintain their corporate headquarters and offices within this district, and Defendants operate a deli located in this district. Further, Plaintiff Hernandez was employed by Defendants in this district.

### **PARTIES**

#### *Plaintiff*

17. Plaintiff Moises Hernandez (“Plaintiff Hernandez” or “Mr. Hernandez”) is an adult individual residing in New York County, New York.

18. Plaintiff Hernandez was employed by Defendants at Bread & Butter from approximately 2000 until on or about August 19, 2020.

19. Plaintiff Hernandez consents to being a party plaintiff pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), and brings these claims based upon the allegations herein as a representative party of a prospective class of similarly situated individuals under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

20. At all relevant times, Defendants owned, operated, or controlled a deli, located at 419 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10016 under the name “Bread and Butter”.

21. Upon information and belief, Food & Beyond LLC (d/b/a Bread and Butter) is a domestic corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York. Upon information and belief, it maintains its principal place of business at 419 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10016.

22. Defendant Barnabas Y. Woo is an individual engaging (or who was engaged) in business in this judicial district during the relevant time period. Defendant Barnabas Y. Woo is sued individually in his capacity as owner, officer and/or agent of Defendant Corporation. Defendant Barnabas Y. Woo possesses operational control over Defendant Corporation, an ownership interest in Defendant Corporation, and controls significant functions of Defendant Corporation. He determines the wages and compensation of the employees of Defendants, including Plaintiff Hernandez, establishes the schedules of the employees, maintains employee records, and has the authority to hire and fire employees.

23. Defendant Jimmy Kim is an individual engaging (or who was engaged) in business in this judicial district during the relevant time period. Defendant Jimmy Kim is sued individually in his capacity as owner, officer and/or agent of Defendant Corporation. Defendant Jimmy Kim possesses operational control over Defendant Corporation, an ownership interest in Defendant Corporation, and controls significant functions of Defendant Corporation. He determines the wages and compensation of the employees of Defendants, including Plaintiff Hernandez, establishes the schedules of the employees, maintains employee records, and has the authority to hire and fire employees.

24. Defendant Kevin Choi is an individual engaging (or who was engaged) in business in this judicial district during the relevant time period. Defendant Kevin Choi is sued individually in his capacity as a manager of Defendant Corporation. Defendant Kevin Choi possesses operational

control over Defendant Corporation and controls significant functions of Defendant Corporation. He determines the wages and compensation of the employees of Defendants, including Plaintiff Hernandez, establishes the schedules of the employees, maintains employee records, and has the authority to hire and fire employees.

25. Defendant Hyun Park is an individual engaging (or who was engaged) in business in this judicial district during the relevant time period. Defendant Hyun Park is sued individually in his capacity as owner, officer and/or agent of Defendant Corporation. Defendant Hyun Park possesses operational control over Defendant Corporation, an ownership interest in Defendant Corporation, and controls significant functions of Defendant Corporation. He determines the wages and compensation of the employees of Defendants, including Plaintiff Hernandez, establishes the schedules of the employees, maintains employee records, and has the authority to hire and fire employees.

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

#### *Defendants Constitute Joint Employers*

26. Defendants operate a deli located in The Rose Hill section of Manhattan.

27. Individual Defendants, Barnabas Y. Woo, Jimmy Kim, Kevin Choi, and Hyun Park, possess operational control over Defendant Corporation, possess ownership interests in Defendant Corporation, or control significant functions of Defendant Corporation.

28. Defendants are associated and joint employers, act in the interest of each other with respect to employees, pay employees by the same method, and share control over the employees.

29. Each Defendant possessed substantial control over Plaintiff Hernandez's (and other similarly situated employees') working conditions, and over the policies and practices with respect to the employment and compensation of Plaintiff Hernandez, and all similarly situated individuals, referred to herein.

employees) and are Plaintiff Hernandez's (and all similarly situated employees') employers within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. 201 *et seq.* and the NYLL.

31. In the alternative, Defendants constitute a single employer of Plaintiff Hernandez and/or similarly situated individuals.

32. Upon information and belief, Individual Defendants Barnabas Y. Woo, Jimmy Kim, and Hyun Park operate Defendant Corporation as either an alter ego of themselves and/or fail to operate Defendant Corporation as an entity legally separate and apart from themselves, by among other things:

- a) failing to adhere to the corporate formalities necessary to operate Defendant Corporation as a Corporation,
- b) defectively forming or maintaining the corporate entity of Defendant Corporation, by, amongst other things, failing to hold annual meetings or maintaining appropriate corporate records,
- c) transferring assets and debts freely as between all Defendants,
- d) operating Defendant Corporation for their own benefit as the sole or majority shareholders,
- e) operating Defendant Corporation for their own benefit and maintaining control over this corporation as a closed Corporation,
- f) intermingling assets and debts of their own with Defendant Corporation,
- g) diminishing and/or transferring assets of Defendant Corporation to avoid full liability as necessary to protect their own interests, and
- h) Other actions evincing a failure to adhere to the corporate form.

33. At all relevant times, Defendants were Plaintiff Hernandez's employers within the meaning of the FLSA and New York Labor Law. Defendants had the power to hire and fire Plaintiff

Hernandez, controlled the terms and conditions of employment, and determined the rate and method of any compensation in exchange for Plaintiff Hernandez's services.

34. In each year from 2014 to 2020, Defendants, both separately and jointly, had a gross annual volume of sales of not less than \$500,000 (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level that are separately stated).

35. In addition, upon information and belief, Defendants and/or their enterprise were directly engaged in interstate commerce. As an example, numerous items that were used in the deli on a daily basis are goods produced outside of the State of New York.

*Individual Plaintiff*

36. Plaintiff Hernandez is a former employee of Defendants who ostensibly was employed as a delivery worker. However, he spent over 20% of each shift performing the non-tipped duties described above.

37. Plaintiff Hernandez seeks to represent a class of similarly situated individuals under 29 U.S.C. 216(b).

*Plaintiff Moises Hernandez*

38. Plaintiff Hernandez was employed by Defendants from approximately 2000 until on or about August 19, 2020.

39. Defendants employed Plaintiff Hernandez as a delivery worker.

40. However, Plaintiff Hernandez was also required to spend a significant portion of his work day performing the non-tipped duties described above.

41. Although Plaintiff Hernandez was employed as a delivery worker, he spent over 20% of each day performing non-tipped work throughout his employment with Defendants.

42. Plaintiff Hernandez regularly handled goods in interstate commerce, such as food and other supplies produced outside the State of New York.

43. Plaintiff Hernandez's work duties required neither discretion nor independent judgment.

in excess of 40 hours per week.

45. From approximately August 2014 until on or about November 30, 2019, Plaintiff Hernandez worked from approximately 5:30 a.m. until on or about 4:30 p.m., 6 days a week (typically 66 hours per week).

46. From approximately December 2019 until on or about March 14, 2020, Plaintiff Hernandez worked from approximately 5:30 a.m. until on or about 8:00 p.m., 6 days a week (typically 87 hours per week).

47. From approximately March 15, 2020 until on or about August 2020, Plaintiff Hernandez worked from approximately 4:30 a.m. until on or about 4:30 p.m., 7 days per week (typically 84 hours per week).

48. Throughout his employment, Defendants paid Plaintiff Hernandez his wages in cash.

49. From approximately August 2014 until on or about December 2018, Defendants paid Plaintiff Hernandez \$13.00 per hour.

50. From approximately January 2019 until on or about August 2020, Defendants paid Plaintiff Hernandez \$15.00 per hour.

51. Defendants never granted Plaintiff Hernandez any breaks or meal periods of any kind.

52. Plaintiff Hernandez was never notified by Defendants that his tips were being included as an offset for wages.

53. Defendants did not account for these tips in any daily or weekly accounting of Plaintiff Hernandez's wages.

54. Defendants withheld a portion of Plaintiff Hernandez's tips; specifically, Defendants withheld a third of all the non-cash tips customers wrote in for Plaintiff Hernandez and paid these tips to non-tipped workers such as sandwich makers and managers.

55. Defendants did not provide Plaintiff Hernandez an accurate statement of wages, as required by NYLL 195(3).



inaccurate wages and hours worked.

57. Defendants did not give any notice to Plaintiff Hernandez, in English and in Spanish (Plaintiff Hernandez's primary language), of his rate of pay, employer's regular pay day, and such other information as required by NYLL §195(1).

58. Defendants required Plaintiff Hernandez to purchase "tools of the trade" with his own funds—including a bicycle and bicycle accessories.

*Defendants' General Employment Practices*

59. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff Hernandez (and all similarly situated employees) to work in excess of 40 hours a week without paying him appropriate spread of hours pay and overtime compensation as required by federal and state laws.

60. Plaintiff Hernandez was a victim of Defendants' common policy and practices which violate his rights under the FLSA and New York Labor Law by, *inter alia*, not paying him the wages he was owed for the hours he worked.

61. Defendants required Plaintiff Hernandez and all other delivery workers to perform general non-tipped tasks in addition to their primary duties as delivery workers.

62. Plaintiff Hernandez and all similarly situated employees, ostensibly were employed as tipped employees by Defendants, although their actual duties included a significant amount of time spent performing the non-tipped duties outlined above.

63. Plaintiff Hernandez's duties were not incidental to his occupation as a tipped worker, but instead constituted entirely unrelated general deli work with duties, including the non-tipped duties described above.

64. Defendants paid Plaintiff Hernandez his wages in cash.

required postings or notices to employees regarding the applicable wage and hour requirements of the FLSA and NYLL.

66. Upon information and belief, these practices by Defendants were done willfully to disguise the actual number of hours Plaintiff Hernandez (and similarly situated individuals) worked, and to avoid paying Plaintiff Hernandez properly for his full hours worked.

67. Defendants engaged in their unlawful conduct pursuant to a corporate policy of minimizing labor costs and denying employees compensation by knowingly violating the FLSA and NYLL.

68. Defendants' unlawful conduct was intentional, willful, in bad faith, and caused significant damages to Plaintiff Hernandez and other similarly situated former workers.

69. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff Hernandez and other employees with accurate wage statements at the time of their payment of wages, containing: the dates of work covered by that payment of wages; name of employee; name of employer; address and phone number of employer; rate or rates of pay and basis thereof, whether paid by the hour, shift, day, week, salary, piece, commission, or other; gross wages; deductions; allowances, if any, claimed as part of the minimum wage; net wages; the regular hourly rate or rates of pay; the overtime rate or rates of pay; the number of regular hours worked; and the number of overtime hours worked, as required by NYLL §195(3).

70. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff Hernandez and other employees, at the time of hiring and on or before February 1 of each subsequent year, a statement in English and the employees' primary language, containing: the rate or rates of pay and basis thereof, whether paid by the hour, shift, day, week, salary, piece, commission, or other; allowances, if any, claimed as part of the minimum wage, including tip, meal, or lodging allowances; the regular pay day designated by the employer; the name of the employer; any "doing business as" names used by the employer; the physical address of the employer's main office or principal place of business, and a mailing address if different; and the telephone number of the employer, as required by New York Labor Law §195(1).

71. Plaintiff Hernandez brings his FLSA overtime compensation and liquidated damages claims as a collective action pursuant to FLSA Section 16(b), 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), on behalf of all similarly situated persons (the “FLSA Class members”), i.e., persons who are or were employed by Defendants or any of them, on or after the date that is three years before the filing of the complaint in this case (the “FLSA Class Period”).

72. At all relevant times, Plaintiff Hernandez and other members of the FLSA Class were similarly situated in that they had substantially similar job requirements and pay provisions, and have been subject to Defendants’ common practices, policies, programs, procedures, protocols and plans including willfully failing and refusing to pay them the required overtime pay at a one and one-half their regular rates for work in excess of forty (40) hours per workweek under the FLSA under the FLSA.

73. The claims of Plaintiff Hernandez stated herein are similar to those of the other employees.

### **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **VIOLATION OF THE OVERTIME PROVISIONS OF THE FLSA**

74. Plaintiff Hernandez repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

75. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants were Plaintiff Hernandez’s employers (and employers of the putative FLSA Class members) within the meaning of the Fair Labor Standards Act. 29 U.S.C. § 203(d). Defendants had the power to hire and fire Plaintiff Hernandez (and the FLSA Class members), controlled the terms and conditions of employment, and determined the rate and method of any compensation in exchange for his employment.

76. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants were engaged in commerce or in an industry or activity affecting commerce.

77. Defendants constitute an enterprise within the meaning of the Fair Labor Standards

78. Defendants, in violation of 29 U.S.C. § 207(a)(1), failed to pay Plaintiff Hernandez (and the FLSA Class members) overtime compensation at a rate of one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for each hour worked in excess of forty hours in a work week.

79. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff Hernandez (and the FLSA Class members), overtime compensation was willful within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 255(a).

80. Plaintiff Hernandez (and the FLSA Class members) were damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

### **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **VIOLATION OF THE OVERTIME PROVISIONS**

##### **OF THE NEW YORK STATE LABOR LAW**

81. Plaintiff Hernandez repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

82. Defendants, in violation of N.Y. Lab. Law § 190 *et seq.*, and supporting regulations of the New York State Department of Labor, failed to pay Plaintiff Hernandez overtime compensation at rates of one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for each hour worked in excess of forty hours in a work week.

83. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff Hernandez overtime compensation was willful within the meaning of N.Y. Lab. Law § 663.

84. Plaintiff Hernandez was damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

### **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **VIOLATION OF THE SPREAD OF HOURS WAGE ORDER**

##### **OF THE NEW YORK COMMISSIONER OF LABOR**

85. Plaintiff Hernandez repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

minimum wage rate before allowances for each day Plaintiff Hernandez's spread of hours exceeded ten hours in violation of NYLL §§ 650 *et seq.* and 12 N.Y.C.R.R. §§ 146-1.6.

87. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff Hernandez an additional hour's pay for each day Plaintiff Hernandez's spread of hours exceeded ten hours was willful within the meaning of NYLL § 663.

88. Plaintiff Hernandez was damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

#### **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

##### **VIOLATION OF THE NOTICE AND RECORDKEEPING**

##### **REQUIREMENTS OF THE NEW YORK LABOR LAW**

89. Plaintiff Hernandez repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

90. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff Hernandez with a written notice, in English and in Spanish (Plaintiff Hernandez's primary language), containing: the rate or rates of pay and basis thereof, whether paid by the hour, shift, day, week, salary, piece, commission, or other; allowances, if any, claimed as part of the minimum wage, including tip, meal, or lodging allowances; the regular pay day designated by the employer; the name of the employer; any "doing business as" names used by the employer; the physical address of the employer's main office or principal place of business, and a mailing address if different; and the telephone number of the employer, as required by NYLL §195(1).

91. Defendants are liable to Plaintiff Hernandez in the amount of \$5,000, together with costs and attorneys' fees.

#### **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

##### **VIOLATION OF THE WAGE STATEMENT PROVISIONS**

##### **OF THE NEW YORK LABOR LAW**

forth herein.

93. With each payment of wages, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff Hernandez with an accurate statement listing each of the following: the dates of work covered by that payment of wages; name of employee; name of employer; address and phone number of employer; rate or rates of pay and basis thereof, whether paid by the hour, shift, day, week, salary, piece, commission, or other; gross wages; deductions; allowances, if any, claimed as part of the minimum wage; net wages; the regular hourly rate or rates of pay; the overtime rate or rates of pay; the number of regular hours worked; and the number of overtime hours worked, as required by NYLL 195(3).

94. Defendants are liable to Plaintiff Hernandez in the amount of \$5,000, together with costs and attorneys' fees.

### **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **RECOVERY OF EQUIPMENT COSTS**

95. Plaintiff Hernandez repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

96. Defendants required Plaintiff Hernandez to pay, without reimbursement, the costs and expenses for purchasing and maintaining equipment and "tools of the trade" required to perform his job, further reducing his wages in violation of the FLSA and NYLL. 29 U.S.C. § 206(a); 29 C.F.R. § 531.35; N.Y. Lab. Law §§ 193 and 198-b.

97. Plaintiff Hernandez was damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Hernandez respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment against Defendants by:

(a) Designating this action as a collective action and authorizing prompt issuance of notice pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) to all putative class members apprising them of the pendency

of this action, and permitting them to promptly file consents to be Plaintiffs in the FLSA claims in  
[Case 1:20-cv-07705-ER Document 1 Filed 09/18/20 Page 15 of 17](#)  
this action;

(b) Declaring that Defendants violated the overtime wage provisions of, and associated rules and regulations under, the FLSA as to Plaintiff Hernandez and the FLSA Class members;

(c) Declaring that Defendants' violations of the provisions of the FLSA were willful as to Plaintiff Hernandez and the FLSA Class members;

(d) Awarding Plaintiff Hernandez and the FLSA Class members damages for the amount of unpaid overtime compensation and damages for any improper deductions or credits taken against wages under the FLSA as applicable;

(e) Awarding Plaintiff Hernandez and the FLSA Class members liquidated damages in an amount equal to 100% of his damages for the amount of unpaid overtime compensation, and damages for any improper deductions or credits taken against wages under the FLSA as applicable pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);

(f) Declaring that Defendants violated the overtime wage provisions of, and rules and orders promulgated under, the NYLL as to Plaintiff Hernandez;

(g) Declaring that Defendants violated the spread-of-hours requirements of the NYLL and supporting regulations as to Plaintiff Hernandez;

(h) Declaring that Defendants violated the notice requirements of the NYLL with respect to Plaintiff Hernandez's compensation, hours, wages and any deductions or credits taken against wages;

(i) Declaring that Defendants' violations of the provisions of the NYLL and spread of hours wage order were willful as to Plaintiff Hernandez;

(j) Awarding Plaintiff Hernandez damages for the amount of unpaid overtime compensation, and for any improper deductions or credits taken against wages, as well as awarding spread of hours pay under the NYLL as applicable

(k) Awarding Plaintiff Hernandez damages for Defendants' violation of the NYLL

(l) Awarding Plaintiff Hernandez liquidated damages in an amount equal to one hundred percent (100%) of the total amount of overtime compensation and spread of hours pay shown to be owed pursuant to NYLL § 663 as applicable; and liquidated damages pursuant to NYLL § 198(3);

(m) Awarding Plaintiff Hernandez and the FLSA Class members pre-judgment and post-judgment interest as applicable;

(n) Awarding Plaintiff Hernandez and the FLSA Class members the expenses incurred in this action, including costs and attorneys' fees;

(o) Providing that if any amounts remain unpaid upon the expiration of ninety days following issuance of judgment, or ninety days after expiration of the time to appeal and no appeal is then pending, whichever is later, the total amount of judgment shall automatically increase by fifteen percent, as required by NYLL § 198(4); and

(p) All such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

**JURY DEMAND**

Plaintiff Hernandez demands a trial by jury on all issues triable by a jury.

Dated: New York, New York

September 15, 2020

MICHAEL FAILLACE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

By: /s/ Michael Faillace  
Michael Faillace [MF-8436]  
60 East 42nd Street, Suite 4510  
New York, New York 10165  
Telephone: (212) 317-1200  
Facsimile: (212) 317-1620  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff*



# Michael Faillace & Associates, P.C.

Employment and Litigation Attorneys

60 E 42<sup>nd</sup> Street, Suite 4510  
New York, New York 10165  
[Faillace@employmentcompliance.com](mailto:Faillace@employmentcompliance.com)

Telephone: (212) 317-1200  
Facsimile: (212) 317-1620

August 31, 2020

BY ELECTRONIC SIGNATURE

TO: Clerk of Court,

I hereby consent to join this lawsuit as a party plaintiff.

**(Yo, por medio de este documento, doy mi consentimiento para formar parte de la demanda como uno de los demandantes.)**

Name / Nombre:

Moises Hernandez

Legal Representative / Abogado:

Michael Faillace & Associates, P.C.

Signature / Firma:



Date / Fecha:

31 de Agosto 2020